

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, and 15 being independent. Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15, and 18. The original specification and drawings support the claim amendments, for example, see pages 3 and 15. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are presented and directed to subject matter of the original disclosure.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 A. AND B.

A. **Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-14, and 16-19** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,639,943 to Radha et al. (hereinafter “Radha”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,811 in view of Rose in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,233 to Takashima and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,399 in view of Keith et al. (hereinafter “Keith”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 1** to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 1 now recites a method of processing media content utilizing a multimedia application program interface (API) which automatically identifies and adapts to a processing system, the method comprising:

generating a motion compensated prediction of a region of media content;

receiving an indication of whether there are first and second quantities of residual samples remaining for refining the prediction, on a per-region basis, wherein the

indication comprises one or more values associated with one or more picture-level parameters;  
adding of the first quantity of residual samples to the prediction to generate a refined prediction value, when so indicated;  
subtracting the second quantity of residual samples from the refined prediction value to generate a final representation, when so indicated;  
sending any prediction control information necessary for generation of a motion compensated predicted region to an accelerator;  
sending an indication to the accelerator of whether the first and second quantities of residual samples are to be applied; and  
performing subsequent processing and/or rendering at the accelerator.

In making out the rejection of this claim the Office argues that claim 1 is obvious over Radha, Rose, Takashima, and/or Keith. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Applicant amends claim 1 to recite “*a method of processing media content utilizing a multimedia application program interface (API) which automatically identifies and adapts to a processing system.*” Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, Takashima, and/or Keith do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest these claimed features and that he would update his search. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 2-5 and 7-9** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features

that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

### **Independent Claim 10**

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 10** to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 10 now recites (emphasis added) “one or more computer-readable storage media having computer-readable instructions stored thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement a decoder of media content to generate a motion compensated prediction of at least a region of media content, to receive an indication of one or more sets of samples of residual information to further refine the prediction, wherein the indication comprises one or more values associated with one or more picture-level parameters, and to add a first set of such samples to the prediction to generate a modified prediction, if indicated, and to subtract a second set of such samples from the modified prediction to generate a final motion compensated prediction of the region, if indicated, and wherein the executable instructions on the storage medium cause prediction control information necessary for generation of the motion compensated prediction and the indications of whether the first and/or second quantity of residual samples are to be applied and the actual first and second sets of residual samples to be sent to an accelerator communicatively coupled to

the decoder by *a multimedia application program interface (API)* for subsequent processing and/or rendering, *wherein the API automatically identifies and adapts to the decoder and the accelerator.*”

In making out the rejection of this claim the Office argues that claim 10 is obvious over Radha, Rose, Takashima, and/or Keith. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Applicant amends claim 10 to recite “*a multimedia application program interface (API)* for subsequent processing and/or rendering, *wherein the API automatically identifies and adapts to the decoder and the accelerator.*” Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, Takashima, and/or Keith do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest these claimed features and that he would update his search. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 12-14** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 10 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**Dependent claims 16-19** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 15 (discussed in section B below) and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 15 and 20** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,639,943 to Radha et al. (hereinafter “Radha”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,811 in view of Rose in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,233 to Takashima in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,399 in view of Keith et al. (hereinafter “Keith”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,059 to Sriram et al (hereinafter “Sriram”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 15** to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Amended claim 15 now recites a system implemented at least in part on a computing device, comprising (emphasis added):

a decoder application to receive a region of media content and control generation of decoded media content; and

an application program interface (API), communicatively coupling the decoder application with a hardware accelerator by way of at least one of a plurality of autonegotiation structures, wherein if the API receives an indication of one or more sets of residual samples, the first set of samples is added to a motion compensated prediction to generate a refinement of a prediction value, when so indicated, and a second set of samples is subtracted from the refined prediction value to generate a final representation, *when so indicated, wherein the API automatically identifies and adapts to the decoder and the hardware accelerator.*

In making out the rejection of this claim the Office argues that claim 15 is obvious over Radha, Rose, Takashima, Keith, and/or Sriram. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Applicant amends claim 15 to recite *“wherein if the API receives an indication of one or more sets of residual samples, the first set of samples is added to a motion compensated prediction to generate a refinement of a prediction value, when so indicated, and a second set of samples is subtracted from the refined prediction value to generate a final representation, when so indicated, wherein the API automatically identifies and adapts to the decoder and the hardware accelerator.”* Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, Takashima, Keith, and/or Sriram do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest these claimed features and that he would update his search. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Dependent claim 20** depends indirectly from independent claim 15 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of the dependent claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: 6-2-2008

By: Shirley Lee Anderson  
Shirley Lee Anderson  
Reg. No. 57,763  
509.324.9256 ext. 258